

REMARKS

Claims 2 and 4-8 are pending in the application. It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 4-8 have been allowed. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (U.S. Patent 5,953,311) in view of Uesugi (U.S. Patent 6,510,133) and further in view of Seki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,694,389).

Regarding the rejection of Claim 2 under §103(a), the Examiner states that Davies et al. in view of Uesugi and Seki et al. renders the claim obvious. Davies et al. discloses timing synchronization in a receiver employing orthogonal frequency division multiplexing; Uesugi discloses a multi-carrier transmission method and data transmitter; and, Seki et al. teaches an OFDM transmission/reception system and transmitting/receiving apparatus.

Davies et al. teaches inserting a Pilot carrier before an IFFT. It is respectfully submitted that this feature merely corresponds to the conventional art of the present application. In other words, the conventional art and Davies et al. suggests inserting N pilot sample data (Pilot symbols) between data symbols.

Claim 2 of the present application teaches that, after the IFFT, copying a part of N data samples of an OFDM symbol in a guard interval insert (209), as shown in Fig. 4B.

Nowhere does Davies et al. teach a guard interval insert for copying a part of the N data samples of the OFDM symbol and inserting the copied data sample in the front of the data symbol.

Further, with reference to the recitations regarding the "Pilot Carrier Inserter" which, the Examiner indicated, is taught by Davies in Fig 4, Davies merely discloses inserting a guard interval, rather than copying a part of N data samples of an OFDM symbol and inserting the copied data samples in the front of the OFDM symbol. The pilot carrier inserter of the claims of

the present application simply stores the same name as Davies, their respective functions differ greatly from each other.


Neither Uesugi nor Seki et al. cure the defects of Davies et al.

Based on at least the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 2 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 2 and 4-8, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/MJM/dr